

filed on this bill, pass it promptly, and move on to the next important item on the people's agenda, the balanced budget amendment.

#### BIG CHANGE PROMISED 2 YEARS AGO

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago President Clinton was sworn in to office promising big change. But it became clear that the change America wanted was not going to come from the Clinton White House. So tomorrow the President delivers his State of the Union speech to a historic 104th Congress and a country that is no longer waiting for change to come from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

With an unquestionable mandate from the American people, this Congress is responding to the call for smaller, less intrusive government. We are going to reverse the trend of the Federal Government handing down rigid, one-size-fits-all mandates to our States and localities without even considering the costs we are passing on to them.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to set ourselves on a course to a balanced budget. We are doing that now. We are going to make government smaller and more responsible and more attractive. America is going to keep watching. They are going to keep watching this Congress because this is where the change is happening.

#### THE GANGSTERS OF CHINA AND BURMA AND THE TRADE ISSUE

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, America is grasping for principles to guide our foreign policy decisionmaking in the post-cold-war world. Let me suggest two simple standards. We should be for freedom, and we should be against aggression.

The current administration has decoupled any discussion about trade with any consideration of human rights. This is wrong, and it does not work. By winking at the dictator in Beijing, we have encouraged that gangster regime to go on to even further criminal activities.

I am placing into the RECORD an editorial of the Wall Street Journal detailing the results of an alignment between the gangster regimes in Peking, China, and in Burma.

As for America, we should be on the side of those who are struggling for freedom in Burma and China. In the long run, it is not only what is right but it is what will work for the betterment of the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, the information from the Wall Street Journal to which I referred is as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 11, 1995]

#### ASIA'S DRUG WAR

Trade and information aren't the only things that have gone global. Try drug addiction. Around the world, the U.S. is often portrayed as a society sinking under the weight of drug abuse. But where the U.S. has about 600,000 heroin addicts, Thailand probably has that number in Chiang Mai and Chiang Rai provinces alone. According to the Straits Times, Singapore is treating 7,700 addicts (up from 5,700 in 1990). Assuming, improbably, that these are the only ones, Singapore still has an addiction rate 12% higher than the U.S. Malaysia claims about 100,000 addicts, Taiwan about 50,000, and the standard estimate for Vietnam is 500,000.

Without much doubt these figures understate the severity of the problem in some countries. When Taiwan seized 1,114 kilos of heroin in 1993, officials claimed the bulk was for domestic consumption. Hong Kong clinics have registered a 50% jump in female addicts since 1993, which they attribute to the price of a gram of heroin plummeting to \$40, half the price of three years ago.

While the big money is made on the streets of New York and Los Angeles, most of Asia's opium is consumed in Asia. So the explosion in production in the Golden Triangle, especially Burma, is deeply troubling. Opium output has trebled since 1988, to about 3,500 tons, according to Asian officials. Prosecutions are still launched against longtime traffickers in places like Thailand, but in fact the business has rapidly migrated into the hands of new Chinese gangs.

The quality has gone up, and the purity has improved by a factor of 1,000% or more. To understand why, look no farther than Burma's emergence as China's economic satellite.

In the late 1980s, China began courting the Burmese regime, then in bad odor with the rest of the world for slaughtering hundreds of demonstrators. Beijing dropped its support of the Communist Party of Burma and other ethnic rebel groups and opened the long Sino-Burmese border to trade. That pried the lid from a Pandora's Box whose contents are now spilling out into the world through China.

The ex-insurgents, led by the Wa tribal followers of Burma's Communists, nowadays devote themselves to the heroin business. Dozens of refineries have opened along the border, with the drugs moving overland by courier through China and finally out via Hong Kong and Taiwan. These mainland routes have already eclipsed Burmese drug warlord Khun Sa and the Thai export routes under his control.

For the time being, the Rangoon government has reached cease-fires with most of the ethnic rebels in the north, Rangoon leaves them to their drug trafficking, and probably even rakes off a share of the profit, while concentrating its main energies on building up the army and crushing urban dissent. No doubt these cease-fires are temporary: The Burmese military is reportedly set to renew its offensive against the Khun Sa operation, armed with a fresh supply of weapons from Beijing. In time, the army probably hopes to subdue the rest of Burma's minorities as well.

But that goal has eluded the Burmese military for 50 years and for now the local militias still call the shots in the mountainous north. Poppy cultivation has boomed under the spur of competition for buyers. For their part, the Chinese see their Burmese clients as an economic and military bridgehead into Southeast Asia. What they got in the bargain was an opium bridgehead into China.

Junkies are suddenly proliferating along the drug routes through Yunnan and Guangxi, in the inland provinces and even among Beijing's yuppies. China recently admitting to having 300,000 "registered" addicts and called the situation "very grim." Health officials put the real number at 2.5 million. In 1992, the People's Armed Police was sent in to clean out a smuggling center protected by corrupt Yunnan officials. The battle lasted 11 weeks and netted nearly 1,000 kilos of drugs.

China hasn't forgotten that tens of millions were junkies early in the century. Biochemistry being what it is, the simple fact of drugs being available is likely to produce a growing addiction crisis. When Lee Brown of the U.S. Office of National Drug Control Policy toured the region last June, several governments urged him to restart anti-narcotics cooperation with Burma. But the Burmese regime is still in the doghouse with Congress over its human rights record and the detention of Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi.

In any case, the old school, which sees U.S. and European consumers as the main drivers of the heroin trade, may be out of date. Malaysia recently nabbed a high-school-age heroin dealer. Police suspect that pushers are trying to lock in a new clientele among upwardly mobile young users. Asia's wealth is driving a big part of the business these days. And while the U.S. can help, China is the real key to Asia's developing drug crisis.

#### PROVIDING DISASTER ASSISTANCE TO JAPAN IN RESPONSE TO EARTHQUAKE OF JANUARY 1995—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on National Security and ordered to be printed:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

I have directed the Secretary of Defense to provide appropriate disaster assistance to the Government of Japan in response to the devastating earthquake of January 17, 1995. As required by section 404 of title 10, United States Code, I am notifying the Congress that the United States commence disaster relief operations on January 18, 1995, at 11:06 p.m., eastern standard time. To date, the U.S. military has provided 37,000 blankets. In addition, the following information is provided:

1. Disaster relief assistance is being provided in response to an earthquake affecting Kobe and Osaka, Japan.

2. Reports indicate at least 3,100 people have died, nearly 900 are missing, over 16,000 are injured, and an estimated 240,000 are homeless. The destruction of basic physical infrastructure poses a threat to the lives of the survivors.

3. Currently, U.S. military involvement has been limited to 15 U.S. Air Force C-130 Hercules sorties. Further requests for U.S. military assistance in the form of transportation, supplies, services, and equipment are unknown at this time.

4. Switzerland is providing search and rescue dog teams. Assistance by other countries is unknown.

5. Anticipated duration of disaster assistance activities is unknown.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1995.*

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EHLERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. LINCOLN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### CONSIDERATION OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the balanced budget amendment, which will be coming up later this week and possibly continuing into next week. It is a very critical issue which we will be facing in the Congress, and I feel it important that we discuss it in greater detail than we will have time during the formal debate on the floor of this House to discuss and compare the various amendments which are going to come before us. I will talk about some of the similarities and the differences.

□ 1440

I recognize that right now going on on network television are the opening

statements of the O.J. Simpson trial. It will take someone who is very dedicated and very interested in the balanced budget issue to actually be watching at this point in time, but I hope that my colleagues are watching and that in fact they and others interested in this debate will get a copy of what I am going to talk about, to analyze the amendments in depth and in detail prior to our debate coming up later this week.

There has been a great deal of debate over whether or not we should balance the budget. I am not going to enter into that debate today. I personally believe that our country balance its budget, that we cannot continue with several hundred billion dollar deficits each year, and that in fact if we fail to balance the budget, at some point in time we will reach an economic crisis wherein devaluation of our currency or hyper inflation rates or high interest rates, some economic meachancism will in fact make up for the problem which we have today in not balancing our budget. So I am not going to focus on that part of the debate.

It has also been argued even by those who agree that we must balance the budget that in fact there are two different ways to do it. One, requiring in the Constitution by amending the language of our Constitution that we must balance the budget. The other is to do it through statutory reform, by changing statutes themselves, changing the budget process itself, so that in fact we might be able to, through the regular committee action and floor action in this body and the other body, that we might be able to agree to a balanced budget.

It is argued that you do not need to amend the Constitution to balance the budget. In fact, that is correct, you do not. But I also believe that by requiring in the Constitution that we must balance our budget, it will give us that additional impetus, the additional force necessary, the commitment necessary, to actually accomplish that balanced budget. So I favor a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and this discussion is not going to go through the arguments of whether we should or should not file a balanced budget amendment to actually require it.

This is a very serious issue, amending our Constitution. It was created over 200 years ago, and over that time has served us very well and has been amended very few times. In fact, now to change the actual wording in our Constitution is indeed very serious and very critical that we must do it right.

Our first rule in government should be first to do no wrong, to do no harm. We must be certain that the changes we place into our Constitution do not create greater havoc or do greater harm or prevent us from being able to govern this great Nation.

So really the issues I would like to discuss here today come down more to the questions of if we do place into our

Constitution a requirement to balance the budget, what wording should we use and how would in be enforced? What type of enforcement mechanism should we include in the Constitution to require this Government to balance its income and outgo, or its outlays and receipts, was we call it in the various amendments. There are very technical issues and I am going to attempt over the next little while in plain English to outline a comparison of the various amendments that have been filed, so that we can identify where there are similarities and where there are differences.

I plan on focusing on three principal amendments, all three of which have been filed as legislation in this Congress. They are the Barton-Tauzin constitutional amendment, which I believe has the support of the majority leadership in the body. They are also the Schaefer-Stenholm amendment, which is the amendment that has been filed by Senator DOLE, Senator HATCH, and Senator SIMON in the Senate. And also a balanced budget amendment which I have filed in this body, and I would like to compare the three of them.

I would like to analyze the alternative approaches being used in these three different amendments, the approaches and the mechanisms used for enforcement. I would like to identify the differences in these amendments, and there are several. There are some differences in what numbers we are going to be relying upon in balancing the budget. Some of these amendments requires or allow us to use or rely upon estimates of receipts and outlays. Other amendments will require us to deal with actual receipts and outlays. There are significant differences between estimates and actual numbers, and I would like to talk about those.

Also, some of these amendments require the creation of, or do create in the Constitution, a new supermajority requirement for legislative action, while the other relies upon the existing constitutional majorities and the existing supermajority identified in overriding a Presidential veto.

Also the enforcement mechanisms specifically. Some of these, two of these amendments rely upon future implementing legislation in order to set up an enforcement mechanism. The other sets up an enforcement mechanism in the language of the amendment itself.

Also with regard to waiver, two of these amendments allow the Congress to waive the provisions of this article for any year in which the country is in war or military conflict. The other provides a more broad waiver opportunity.

Finally, I would like to outline a possible—rather a probable—constitutional crisis which in fact may be created under the terms and implementation of two of these particular amendments. So those are the things that I would like to talk about.

First of all, let me compare the similarities in these amendments. The